REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant has received the Office action dated October 19, 2005, in which the Examiner: 1) rejected claims 1-5, 8-11, 14-25, and 28-33 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 6,256,732 ("*Cromer*") in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,519,698 ("*Leyda*").

With this Response, Applicant has amended claims 1, 17-18, 24 and 29. Based on the amendments and arguments contained herein, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims.

I. CLAIM REJECTIONS

Amended claim 1, in part, requires "a host computer including a CPU coupled to memory, wherein the memory stores host-specific information" and "a management device coupled to said host, wherein a copy of said host-specific information is transferred from the memory to the management device during a boot process of the host computer." Claim 1 further requires "if a network device later sends a request to the host computer, the management device provides a response to the network device based on the host-specific information stored in the management device."

In *Cromer*, the (host) computer system 12 automatically provides its capabilities to the main computer 102 without powering on (see col. 2, lines 32-35). Thus, *Cromer* does not teach or suggest "a copy of said host-specific information is transferred from the memory to the management device during a boot process of the host computer" as required in claim 1. *Leyda* mentions storing system configuration information obtained during initialization into a non-volatile storage 113 or 114 (see col. 4, lines 5-9). However, the system in *Leyda* later teaches skipping the power-on-self-test (POST) process or storing the system configuration information after the POST is complete (see col. 4, lines 57-65). In other words, *Leyda* is not seen to teach "a copy of the said host-specific information is transferred from the memory to [a] management device during a boot process of the host computer" as required in claim 1. None of the references cited by the Examiner, considered individually or together, teach or suggest the above limitation.

Furthermore, *Leyda's* non-volatile storage 113 or 114 is not a "management device" as required in claim 1. Claim 1 defines the management device by stating "if a network device later sends a request to the host computer, the management device provides a response to the network device based on the host-specific information stored in the management device." In contrast, *Cromer's* computer system 12 provides its capabilities to the main computer 102 simply by establishing a link and receiving auxiliary power (see col. 2, lines 56-63). None of the references cited by the Examiner, considered individually or together, teach or suggest Applicant's claimed "a copy of the said host-specific information is transferred from the memory to [a] management device during a boot process of the host computer" and "if a network device later sends a request to the host computer, the management device provides a response to the network device based on the host-specific information stored in the management device." For at least these reasons, claim 1 and its dependent claims are allowable.

Amended claim 17, in part, requires "a logic unit sub-system" having a "CPU" and "memory coupled to the CPU." The logic unit sub-system "is adapted to couple to a host computer and store a table containing host computer information in the memory." Claim 17 further requires that "the table is transferred from the host computer system and stored in the memory during a power on self test of the host computer" and "the logic unit sub-system later uses the table to respond to network requests for information on behalf of the host computer."

As described with respect to claim 1, *Cromer* provides its capabilities to the main computer 102 without powering on (see col. 2, lines 32-35). Thus, *Cromer* does not teach or suggest Applicant's claimed "the table is transferred from the host computer system and stored in the memory during a power on self test of the host computer." This deficiency of *Cromer* is not cured by *Leyda* (see col. 4, lines 57-65). None of the references cited by the Examiner, considered individually or together, teach or suggest "[a] table is transferred from the host

computer system and stored in the memory during a power on self test of the host computer" as required in claim 17.

Furthermore, *Leyda's* non-volatile storage 113 or 114 and *Cromer's* main computer 102 are not "logic unit sub-systems" as required in claim 17. Claim 17 defines the logic unit sub-system by stating "the logic unit sub-system later uses the table to respond to network requests for information on behalf of the host computer." None of the references cited by the Examiner, considered individually or together, teach or suggest Applicant's claimed "[a] table is transferred from the host computer system and stored in the memory during a power on self test of the host computer" and "the logic unit sub-system later uses the table to respond to network requests for information on behalf of the host computer." For at least these reasons, claim 17 and its dependent claims are allowable.

Amended claim 24, in part, requires "searching for host computer specific information during a boot process of the host computer" and "storing the information in a memory of the logic unit...wherein said searching and storing occur before run-time of the host computer." Claim 24 further requires "using the information stored in said memory to independently respond to network requests for information on behalf of the host computer."

None of the references cited by the Examiner, considered individually or together, teach or suggest Applicant's claimed "searching for host computer specific information during a boot process of the host computer" and "storing the information in a memory of the logic unit...wherein said searching and storing occur before run-time of the host computer." As described previously, *Cromer's* computer system 12 provides information to the main computer 102 while powered off and *Leyda's* computer stores information into the non-volatile memory after a POST is complete.

Furthermore, none of the references cited by the Examiner, considered individually or together, teach or suggest "using the information stored in said memory to independently respond to network requests for information on behalf of the host computer." *Cromer's* computer system 12 does not "[use] the information stored in said memory to independently respond to network requests

for information on behalf of the host computer." Instead, *Cromer's* computer system 12 provides information to a main computer 102 simply by establishing a link and receiving auxiliary power. For at least these reasons, claim 24 and its dependent claims are allowable.

Amended claim 29, in part, requires "a management unit coupled to the peripheral interface of the host computer, the management unit accesses and stores the information table during a boot process of the host computer. Claim 29 further requires "if [a] network device sends a request to the host computer, the management unit is operable to respond to the request using the information table stored in the management unit."

Cromer and *Leyda* fail to teach Applicant's claimed "[a] management unit accesses and stores the information table during a boot process of the host computer." Furthermore, none of the references cited by the Examiner, considered individually or together, teach "if [a] network device sends a request to the host computer, the management unit is operable to respond to the request using the information table stored in the management unit." As previously described, *Cromer's* computer system 12 provides its capabilities to the main computer 102 simply by establishing a link and receiving auxiliary power (see col. 2, lines 56-63). For at least these reasons, claim 29 and its dependent claims are allowable.

II. CONCLUSIONS

In the course of the foregoing discussions, Applicant may have at times referred to claim limitations in shorthand fashion, or may have focused on a particular claim element. This discussion should not be interpreted to mean that the other limitations can be ignored or dismissed. The claims must be viewed as a whole, and each limitation of the claims must be considered when determining the patentability of the claims. Moreover, it should be understood that there may be other distinctions between the claims and the cited art which have yet to be raised, but which may be raised in the future.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. It is believed that no extensions of time or fees

are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a), and any fees required (including fees for net addition of claims) are hereby authorized to be charged to Hewlett-Packard Development Company's Deposit Account No. 08-2025.

Respectfully submitted,

Alan D. Christenson
PTO Reg. No. 54,036
CONLEY ROSE, P.C.
(713) 238-8000 (Phone)
(713) 238-8008 (Fax)
AGENT FOR APPLICANT

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
Legal Dept., M/S 35
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400